In the Drawings:

A replacement sheet is attached hereto in Appendix A.

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are pending in this application. Claims 39-42 have been canceled without prejudice to resubmitting them in a divisional application. Claims 1, 12, 13, and 19 are in independent form. Claims 2-11 and 15-18 depend from claim 1, claim 14 depends from claim 13, and claims 20-38 depend from claim 19. Claims 24-38 have been amended to depend from claims 19. Several obvious typographical errors have been corrected. No new matter has been entered.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 12-14. Claims 12 and 13 have been amended to independent form. Claims 12-14 are submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Applicant hereby confirms the election of group 1, claims 1-23. Claims 24-38 have been amended to depend from claim 19 and claims 39-42 have been canceled. Corrected drawing sheets for Figs. 7-8 are attached hereto removing characters 8 and 9, which were meant to show that the corresponding figure was a cross-sectional view of Figures 8 and 9 respectively. Since these notations are not necessary, they have been removed. A replacement sheet is attached in Appendix A.

Claims 9 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting structural cooperative relationships of elements. Claims 9 and 16 have been amended accordingly.

Claims 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publ. No. 2002/0000477 to Hara. Claims 1-5, 11, and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hara in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,383,605 to Teague. Claim 6 was rejected in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,405,086 to Kranzle, claim 23 was rejected over Hara in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,571,807 to Jones, and claims 7-10 were rejected in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,238,191 to Gaymon.

Hara concerns a high pressure spraying apparatus. As stated in the specification at page 5, paragraph 0046, the device is used to accelerate liquid droplets to "sonic or supersonic speed." Hara concerns a nozzle that has an external passageway 37 for accepting a gas at a gas inlet 22. A compressor 12 is connected to the gas inlet 22 for providing the gas. In addition, a powder 16 and water 18 may be added to the compressed gas before reaching the inlet 22. A cleaning liquid 14 enters the nozzle via an internal passageway 34. The gas and liquid mix at the nozzle 24.

Claim 19 concerns a pressure washer that pumps a fluid at at least a low pressure and a high pressure. The device of Hara is only designed to pump a gas at high pressure, with the gas being mixed with a liquid at the nozzle to add liquid droplets to the gas. Claim 19 also describes an injector that can spray at a high or a low pressure. Hara does not teach an injector that can spray at a low pressure. Moreover, claim 19 teaches a device having at least three modes of operation, one of which is a low pressure spray mode. Hara does not teach a low pressure spray mode. Claim 21 teaches a spray lance positioned between the pump and the injector. Hara does not teach a spray lance at this location. The Examiner's explanation of why claims 19-22 are purportedly anticipated by Hara does not take into account the wording of the claims. This rejection is requested to be reconsidered by the Examiner. Claims 19-22 are submitted to not be anticipated by Hara.

Claims 1-5, 11, and 15-18 were rejected as obvious based upon the combination of Hara and Teague. Teague teaches a pressure washer having a spray lance and three chemical tanks with associated chemical inlets. The tanks are remotely operated via electronic controls on the handle of the spray lance. The lance has either an on or an off position, with no variability in pressure. The chemical sources are positioned upstream of the pump, so that when a chemical is signaled to be released into the fluid stream, the chemical has to travel through the pump, which can cause deterioration of the pump.

Claim 1 concerns a pressure washer that has a pump that selectively pumps fluid at a pressure that ranges from low to high. Neither Hara nor Teague teaches this aspect of the claim. Claim 1 also concerns an injector that has a movable external member. Neither Hara nor Teague teaches this aspect of the claim. In addition, claim 1 states that the second chemical inlet is positioned downstream from the nozzle. In Hara, the chemical inlet is upstream from the nozzle. In Teague, the chemical inlets are upstream of the pump and the nozzle, which means that the pump will be subject to deterioration as a result of contact with the chemicals. Thus, the combination of Hara and Teague does not teach many aspects of claim 1, or the claims that depend therefrom. Claims 1-5, 11, and 15-18 are submitted to be allowable over Hara and Teague.

With respect to the rejections of claims 6, 23, and 7-10, the additional references do not supply the features that are missing from Hara and/or Teague. Kranzle teaches a cart. Jones teaches a variable speed pump. Gaymon teaches a wand with a storage bottle mounted thereon.

None of these references teaches the claimed location of the nozzle relative to the chemical inlet or an external member that is movable. Therefore, the cited combinations do not render the claims obvious because elements are still missing.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney if a telephone call could help to resolve any remaining issues.

No claim fees are believed to be due with this response. However, should any fees be required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to deposit account No. 50-1432.

Respectfully submitted,

Price Cooper Reg. No. 40,038

JONES DAY 901 Lakeside Avenue Cleveland, Ohio 44114 (216) 586-7097

Date: February 8, 2007

APPENDIX A

REPLACEMENT DRAWING SHEET